



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,693	08/20/2003	Jeffrey L. Anderson	AAIR-1-1005	6718
7590	07/29/2004		EXAMINER LE, UYEN CHAU N	
Lawrence D. Graham, Esq. BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM PLLC 816 Second Avenue Seattle, WA 98104			ART UNIT 2876	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/644,693

Applicant(s)

ANDERSON, JEFFREY L.

Examiner

Uyen-Chau N. Le

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-18 and 20-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-18 and 20-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Prelim. Amdt/Amendment

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the Amendment filed 05 April 2004.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Re claim 3, line 1: Substitute "he boarding pass" with -- the boarding pass --.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (US 5,793,639) in view of Manabe et al (US 6,594,547).

Re claims 1-9, Yamazaki discloses a method for checking a passenger and baggage into an airline flight, comprising: instructing the passenger to obtain a boarding pass at a first location 2 inside an airport terminal; providing the passenger with a boarding pass and baggage tags, the boarding pass containing information associated with the passenger and an indicator that the passenger has checked in (col. 13, lines 2+); the passenger will then move to a second location 4

Art Unit: 2876

(e.g., the baggage check-in unit) being separated from but in view of the first location 2, the second location 4 further being adjacent a baggage drop conveyor 35 (fig. 3); checking the baggage 34; wherein the second location 4 further comprises a central conveyor 60 and the baggage drop conveyor [35, 73A-D] has a first end and a second end, wherein the first end of the baggage drop conveyor [35, 73A-D] is adjacent the central conveyor 60; the passenger placing the baggage on the baggage drop conveyor [35, 73A-D] substantially at the second end of the baggage drop [35, 73A-D] (figs. 3 and 7); wherein the baggage drop conveyor 35 comprises a scale and the method further comprises the step of weighing the baggage with the scale (col. 13, lines 63+); wherein the first location comprises a remote computer located in a home or office (e.g., a travel agency 30); wherein the first location comprises an electronic kiosk 2 (fig. 3).

Yamazaki fails to teach or fairly suggest of instructing the passenger to present the boarding pass at a second location inside the airport terminal; checking the baggage in accordance with information obtained from the boarding pass; wherein the information contained on the boarding pass is printed on the boarding pass in the form of a bar code; scanning the boarding pass at the second location to retrieve the information; wherein the information comprises a destination and number of bags to be checked; the baggage drop computer having a processor, a display, a scanner and an associated printer.

Manabe et al teaches the passenger presents a boarding pass 9 at a second location 4 inside the airport terminal; checking the baggage in accordance with information obtained from the boarding pass 9; wherein the information contained on the boarding pass is printed on the boarding pass in the form of a bar code 1b; scanning the boarding pass at the second location to retrieve the information, wherein the information comprises a destination and number of bags to

Art Unit: 2876

be checked (col. 3, lines 5-13); the baggage drop computer having a processor, a display, a scanner and an associated printer for print baggage tags (fig. 1).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Manabe et al into the system as taught by Yamazaki in order to provide the passenger a flexibility in checking-in his/her baggage (e.g., in the event the passenger does not like to check his/her baggage in immediately after checking-in, the passenger can always check his/her baggage in any time after checking-in by scanning his/her boarding pass into the baggage check-in system to start the baggage check-in process). Furthermore, by using a conventional barcode instead of IC card would provide Yamazaki with a more feasible system, in which the passenger does not have to purchase an IC card, especially with passengers who are not familiar with IC card, and thus providing a more user friendly system.

5. Claims 11 and 13-18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki as modified by Manabe et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Barclay (US 6,158,658). The teachings of Yamazaki in view of Manabe et al have been discussed above.

Re claims 11 and 13-18: Yamazaki in view of Manabe et al have been discussed above but fail to teach or fairly suggest that the processor executing program instructions to receive and interpret images scanned from the boarding pass and to allow baggage to be checked into the flight at the baggage drop station only if the passenger has already checked in.

Barclay teaches a list of checked-in passenger being provided and compared with the scanned data from a boarding pass/baggage tag, the baggage handler does not load a piece of

Art Unit: 2876

baggage unless its corresponding passenger identifier is listed (col. 4, line 58 through col. 5, line 23).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Barclay into the system as taught by Yamazaki/Manabe et al in order to provide Yamazaki/Manabe et al with a more accurate system preventing baggage from being lost/misallocated in the event the baggage and its corresponding passenger are not boarding on the same plane.

6. Claims 20-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki as modified by Manabe et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ross (US 2003/0061080). The teachings of Yamazaki in view of Manabe et al have been discussed above.

Re claims 20-26, Yamazaki/Manabe et al have been discussed above but fail to teach or fairly suggest that the system further comprising one or more signs directing the passenger to proceed to one or more of the kiosks before proceeding to the baggage drop station.

Ross teaches when a passenger arrive at the airport they are directed by appropriate signs to a passenger information input kiosk 12 (page 9, paragraph [0198]).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Ross into the system as taught by Yamazaki/Manabe et al in order to provide Yamazaki/Manabe et al with a more user friendly system by directing the passenger where to go and what to do in order to check in, preventing the first time passenger from being wondered/lost in finding way to the check-in counter in at the airport.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Newly cited references to Yamazaki and Ross were used in the new ground of rejection to further meet the newly added limitation of claims 1, 10 and 20.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The patents to Kara (US 6,735,575); Iki et al (US 6,695,203); Trabitiz (US 2003/0189094) are cited as of interest and illustrate to a similar structure of an airport check-in system and method.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2876


however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uyen-Chau N. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-2397.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon, Wed. and Fri. 5:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MICHAEL G LEE can be reached on 571-272-2398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Uyen-Chau N. Le
July 12, 2004


MICHAEL G. LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800